



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,211	10/08/2003	Tomohiro Suzuki	03610/LH	8091
1933	7590	02/21/2008	EXAMINER	
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC			PACHOL, NICHOLAS C	
220 Fifth Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
16TH Floor			2625	
NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708			MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE	
			02/21/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/682,211	SUZUKI ET AL.
	Examiner Nicholas C. Pachol	Art Unit 2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Maniwa (US 5,933,584) in view of Cheng (US 5,544,322).

Regarding Claim 1, Maniwa teaches a network system for processing image data (Column 2, lines 36-40), comprising:

- an image-processing apparatus including an image-reading section to read an image from a document (Figure 3, elements 107 and 113);
- an image-printing apparatus including an image-printing section to print an image on a sheet (Figure 2, elements 106 and 112);
- a plurality of networks including a first network and a second network; (Figures 2 and 3, where both networks are independent)

and a plurality of information processing apparatuses including a first information processing apparatus coupled to said first network and a second information processing apparatus coupled to said second network; (Column 1, lines 17-21 and Figures 2 and 3, both networks are independent).

Maniwa does not teach wherein said image-processing apparatus further includes:

an access restriction acquiring section to acquire an access restriction between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus from any one of: (i) one of said plurality of information processing apparatuses, (ii) said image-printing apparatus, and (iii) a storage section provided in said image-processing apparatus itself; and

a routing section to conduct a routing operation between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus, based on said access restriction acquired by said access restriction acquiring section.

However, Cheng does teach wherein said image-processing apparatus further includes:

an access restriction acquiring section to acquire an access restriction between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus from any one of: (i) one of said plurality of information processing apparatuses, (ii) said image-printing apparatus, and (iii) a storage section provided in said image-processing apparatus itself (Column 3, lines 25-40); and

a routing section to conduct a routing operation between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus, based on said access restriction acquired by said access restriction acquiring section (Column 3, lines 41-48).

Maniwa and Cheng are combinable because they both deal with communication amongst apparatuses in a network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maniwa with the teachings of Cheng to create an authentication protocol that provides an authentication to a client (Cheng: Column 3, lines 6-9).

Regarding Claim 2, Maniwa further teaches wherein said image-processing apparatus further includes:

a first network I/F section, through which said image-processing apparatus is coupled to said first network (Figure 2 element 112 though the server 106); and

a second network I/F section, through which said image-processing apparatus is coupled to said second network (Figure 3 element 113 though server 107).

Regarding Claim 3, Maniwa further teaches wherein said image-printing apparatus is coupled to one of: (i) image-processing apparatus, and (ii) one of said plurality of networks (Figure 4, element 101).

Regarding Claim 6, Maniwa further teaches wherein said plurality of information processing apparatuses include a computer. (Column 10, lines 5-7)

Regarding Claim 7, Maniwa teaches a network system for processing image data (Column 2, lines 36-40), comprising:

an image-processing apparatus including an image-reading section to read an image from a document (Figure 3, elements 107 and 113);

an image-printing apparatus including an image-printing section to print an image on a sheet (Figure 2, elements 106 and 112);

a plurality of networks including a first network and a second network; (Figures 2 and 3, where both networks are independent)

and a plurality of information processing apparatuses including a first information processing apparatus coupled to said first network and a second information processing apparatus coupled to said second network; (Column 1, lines 17-21 and Figures 2 and 3, both networks are independent)

Maniwa does not teach wherein said image-printing apparatus further includes:

an access restriction acquiring section to acquire an access restriction between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus from any one of: i) one of said plurality of information processing apparatuses, (ii) said image-processing apparatus, and (iii) a storage section provided in said image-printing apparatus itself; and

Art Unit: 2625

a routing section to conduct a routing operation between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus, based on said access restriction acquired by said access restriction acquiring section

However Cheng does teach wherein said image-printing apparatus further includes:

an access restriction acquiring section to acquire an access restriction between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus from any one of: i) one of said plurality of information processing apparatuses, (ii) said image-processing apparatus, and (iii) a storage section provided in said image-printing apparatus itself (Column 3, lines 25-40); and

a routing section to conduct a routing operation between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus, based on said access restriction acquired by said access restriction acquiring section (Column 3, lines 41-48).

Maniwa and Cheng are combinable because they both deal with communication amongst apparatuses in a network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maniwa with the teachings of Cheng to create an authentication protocol that provides an authentication to a client (Cheng: Column 3, lines 6-9).

Regarding Claim 8, Maniwa further teaches wherein said image-printing apparatus further includes:

a first network I/F section, through which said image-printing apparatus is coupled to said first network (Column 11, Lines 12-18); and

a second network I/F section, through which said image-printing apparatus is coupled to said second network (Column 11, lines 12-18).

Regarding Claim 9, Maniwa further teaches wherein said image-processing apparatus is coupled to one of: (i) said image-printing apparatus, and (ii) one of said plurality of networks (Figure 3, element 101).

Regarding Claim 12, Maniwa further teaches wherein said plurality of information processing apparatuses include a (Column 10, lines 5-7).

Regarding Claim 13, Maniwa teaches a network system for processing image data (Column 2, lines 36-40), comprising:

an image-processing apparatus including an image-reading section to read an image from a document (Figure 3, elements 107 and 113);

an image-printing apparatus including an image-printing section to print an image on a sheet (Figure 2, elements 106 and 112); and

an information processing apparatus coupled to both said image-processing apparatus and said image-printing apparatus through a network (Figure 5, element 501);

wherein one of image-processing apparatus and said image-printing apparatus further includes:

a provable function setting section to establish provable functions for said information processing apparatus, based on said restriction information acquired by said restriction information acquiring section (Column 10, lines 10-17).

Maniwa does not teach a restriction information acquiring section to acquire restriction information, indicating functions, which are provable from one of said image-processing apparatus and said image-printing apparatus to said information processing apparatus, from a storage section provided in one of said image processing apparatus, said image-printing apparatus and said information processing apparatus.

However, Cheng does teach a restriction information acquiring section to acquire restriction information, indicating functions, which are provable from one of said image-processing apparatus and said image-printing apparatus to said information processing apparatus, from a storage section provided in one of said image processing apparatus, said image-printing apparatus and said information processing apparatus (Column 3, lines 25-40).

Maniwa and Cheng are combinable because they both deal with communication amongst apparatuses in a network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maniwa with the teachings of Cheng to create an authentication protocol that provides an authentication to a client (Cheng: Column 3, lines 6-9).

Regarding Claims 16, Maniwa teaches wherein said information processing apparatus is a computer (Column 10, lines 5-7).

4. Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maniwa (US 5,933,584) in view of Cheng (US 5,544,322) further in view of Sakellaropoulos (US 5,790,279).

Regarding Claim 4, Maniwa does teach wherein said image-processing apparatus and said image printing apparatus into a single apparatus; and wherein said single apparatus is couple to both said first network and said second network (Figure 2 and 3).

Maniwa in view of Cheng does not teach wherein said image-processing apparatus and said image printing apparatus into a single apparatus.

Sakellaropoulos does teach wherein said image-processing apparatus and said image printing apparatus into a single apparatus. (Figure 1 and column 1, lines 54-66).

Maniwa in view of Cheng and Sakellaropoulos are combinable because they are dealing with information processing apparatuses.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa in view of Cheng with the teachings of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of having one single apparatus(Column 1, lines 60-64).

Regarding Claim 5, Sakellaropoulos further teaches a single apparatus is a digital copier (column 1 lines 48-51 and 54-66).

Maniwa in view of Cheng and Sakellaropoulos are combinable because they are dealing with information processing apparatuses.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa in view of Cheng with the teachings of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of having one single apparatus(Column 1, lines 60-64).

Regarding Claim 10, Maniwa does teach wherein said image-processing apparatus and said image printing apparatus into a single apparatus; and wherein said single apparatus is couple to both said first network and said second network (Figure 2 and 3).

Maniwa in view of Cheng does not teach wherein said image-processing apparatus and said image printing apparatus into a single apparatus.

Sakellaropoulos does teach wherein said image-processing apparatus and said image printing apparatus into a single apparatus; and wherein said single apparatus is

couple to both said first network and said second network (Figure 1 and column 1, lines 54-66).

Maniwa in view of Cheng and Sakellaropoulos are combinable because they are dealing with information processing apparatuses.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa in view of Cheng with the teachings of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of having one single apparatus(Column 1, lines 60-64).

Regarding Claim 11, Sakellaropoulos further teaches a single apparatus is a digital copier (column 1 lines 48-51 and 54-66).

Maniwa in view of Cheng and Sakellaropoulos are combinable because they are dealing with information processing apparatuses.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa in view of Cheng with the teachings of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of having one single apparatus(Column 1, lines 60-64).

Regarding Claim 14, Maniwa does not teach an image-processing apparatus and image printing apparatus into a single apparatus; and
wherein said single apparatus includes said providable function setting section.

However, Sakellaropoulos does teach an image-processing apparatus and image printing apparatus into a single apparatus; and

wherein said single apparatus includes said provable function setting section (Figure 1 and column 1, lines 54-66).

Maniwa in view of Cheng and Sakellaropoulous are combinable because they are dealing with information processing apparatuses.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa in view of Cheng with the teachings of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of having one single apparatus(Column 1, lines 60-64).

Regarding Claim 15, Sakellaropoulos further teaches a single apparatus is a digital copier (column 1 lines 48-51 and 54-66).

Maniwa in view of Cheng and Sakellaropoulous are combinable because they are dealing with information processing apparatuses.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa in view of Cheng with the teachings of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of having one single apparatus(Column 1, lines 60-64).

Art Unit: 2625

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas C. Pachol whose telephone number is 571-270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T, 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. (EST), Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP
02/12/08



TWYLER LAMB HASKINS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER